

Serial No.: 10/501,882

REMARKS

Claims 9 to 20 have been canceled to advance prosecution in this case. The claims before the Examiner are claims 1 to 8 and 21 to 29.

The rejection of the claims (claim numbers not indicated on page 2 of the Office Action) under 35 USC 102 as anticipated by Moore '427 is respectfully traversed. The reference clearly depicts 1,3-bisphenols and does not teach or suggest a 2,2-bis(4-hydroxyphenyl)adamantane and polycarbonate resins containing same. The reference therefore also does not teach or suggest the optical part molding material of claims 21 to 29.

The rejection of the claims (again not numbered) under 35 USC 102 are anticipated by Hoagland et al. '969 is also respectfully traversed. The claims distinguish over the adamantane copolycarbonates of Hoagland et al. '969 as these copolycarbonates contain 1,3-bis(4-hydroxyphenyl)adamantanes similar to the monomer shown in Moore '427. Indeed, the patents have a common assignee and were filed within weeks of each other. Neither reference teaches or suggests 2,2-bis(4-hydroxyphenyl) adamantane-based polycarbonates with a repetitive unit of Formula (I-1) and a repetitive unit of Formula (I-2) and a process for the production of such

Serial No.: 10/501,882

polycarbonates. (See Comparative Example I-1 on page 28.)

The rejections should be withdrawn.

The rejection of the claims under 35 USC 103 as unpatentable over Moore '427 or Hoagland et al. '969 in view of Day et al. '001 and the rejection of the claims over Moore '427 or Hoagland et al. '969 in view of Lemmon et al. '631 (the rejections are assumed to apply to claims 21 to 29) are respectfully traversed. While the secondary references refer to polycarbonates in optical systems, the references do not overcome that which is missing in the primary references and the rejections should be withdrawn as well. The mention of 2,2-bis(4-hydroxyphenyl) adamantane in a list of various dihydric phenols does not lead an artisan to the particular polycarbonate resins including the recited concentrations constituting the optical part-molding material of claims 21 to 29.

The Examiner is thanked for acknowledging receipt of the certified copies of the priority documents. The application is national stage filing of a PCT application and it is assumed that copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received from the International Bureau. The Examiner is requested to so confirm on the record.

The Examiner is also thanked for listing the reference submitted with an Information Disclosure Statement.


Serial No.: 10/501,882

Reconsideration of the rejection is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

STEPTOE & JOHNSON LLP

October 17, 2005
Date


Charles A. Wendel
Registration No. 24,453

STEPTOE & JOHNSON LLP
1330 Connecticut Ave., N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036
(202) 429-6415

New Attorney Docket No. 28955.4016
Old Attorney Docket No. OHTN:016

CAW/cd